arXiv:1411.5468v1 [math.CO] 20 Nov 2014

Continuous anti-forcing spectra of cata-condensed hexagonal systems*

Kai Deng[a,b], Heping Zhang[a,†]

[a]School of Mathematics and Statistics, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu 730000, P. R. China

[b]School of Mathematics and Information Science, Beifang University of Nationalities, Yinchuan, Ningxia 750027, P. R. China

Abstract

The anti-forcing number of a perfect matching M of a graph G is the minimal number of edges not in M whose removal make M as a unique perfect matching of the resulting graph. The anti-forcing spectrum of G is the set of anti-forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G. In this paper we prove that the anti-forcing spectrum of any cata-condensed hexagonal system is continuous, that is, it is an integer interval.

Key words: Perfect matching; Anti-forcing number; Anti-forcing spectrum; Hexagonal system

1 Introduction

Let G be a simple graph with vertex set $V(G)$ and edge set $E(G)$. A *perfect matching* or 1-factor of G is a set of disjoint edges which covers all vertices of G. Harary et al. [10] proposed the *forcing number* of a perfect matching M of a graph G. The roots of this concept can be found in an earlier paper by Klein and Randić [13]. There, the forcing number has been called the *innate degree of freedom* of a Kekulé structure. The forcing number of a perfect matching M of a graph G is equal to the smallest cardinality of some subset S of M such that M is completely determined by this subset (i.e., S is not contained in other perfect matchings of G). The *minimum* (resp. *maximum*) *forcing number* of G is the minimum (resp. maximum) value over

*Supported by NSFC (grant no. 11371180).

†Corresponding author.

E-mail address: zhanghp@lzu.edu.cn, dengkai04@126.com

forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G. The set of forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G is called the *forcing spectrum* of G [1]. The sum of forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G is called the *degree of freedom* of G, which is relative to Clar's resonance-theoretic ideals [5]. For more results on the matching forcing problem, we refer the reader to [2, 11, 12, 14, 16–20, 23, 24, 26, 27].

In 2007, Vukičević and Trinajstić [21] introduced the *anti-forcing number* that is opposite to the forcing number. The anti-forcing number of a graph G is the smallest number of edges whose removal result in a subgraph of G with a unique perfect matching. After this initial report, several papers appeared on this topic [4, 7, 8, 22, 30].

Recently, Lei, Yeh and Zhang [15] define the *anti-forcing number of a perfect matching* M of a graph G as the minimal number of edges not in M whose removal to make M as a single perfect matching of the resulting graph, denoted by $af(G, M)$. By this definition, the anti-forcing number of a graph G is the smallest anti-forcing number over all perfect matchings of G. Hence the anti-forcing number of G is the *minimum anti-forcing number* of G, denoted by $af(G)$. Naturally, the *maximum anti-forcing number* of G is defined as the largest anti-forcing number over all perfect matchings of G, denoted by $Af(G)$. They [15] also defined the *anti-forcing spectrum* of G as the set of anti-forcing numbers of all perfect matchings of G, and denoted by $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(G)$. If $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(G)$ is an integer interval, then the anti-forcing spectrum of G is called to be *continuous*.

Let M be a perfect matching of a graph G. A cycle C of G is called an *M-alternating cycle* if the edges of C appear alternately in M and $E(G)\backslash M$. If C is an M-alternating cycle of G, then the symmetric difference $M\triangle C := (M - C) \cup (C - M)$ is another perfect matching of G.

A set $\mathcal{A}$ of M-alternating cycles of a graph G is called a *compatible M-alternating set* if any two members of $\mathcal{A}$ either are disjoint or intersect only at edges in M. Let $c'(M)$ denote the cardinality of a maximum compatible M-alternating set of G. For a planar bipartite graph G with a perfect matching M, the following minimax theorem reveals the relationship between $af(G, M)$ and $c'(M)$.

Theorem 1.1 [15]**.** Let G be a planar bipartite graph with a perfect matching M. Then $af(G, M) = c'(M)$.

A *hexagonal system* (or *benzenoid system*) [6] is a finite 2-connected planar bipartite graph in which each interior face is surrounded by a regular hexagon of side length one. Hexagonal systems are of great important for theoretical chemistry since they are the molecular graphs of benzenoid hydrocarbons.

Let H be a hexagonal system with a perfect matching M. A set of M-alternating hexagons (the intersection is allowed) of H is called an *M-alternating set*. A *Fries set* of H is a maximum alternating set over all perfect matchings of H. The size of a Fries

set of H is called the *Fries number* of H and denoted by $Fries(H)$ [9]. It is obvious that an M-alternating set of H is also a compatible M-alternating set. By Theorem 1.1, $Af(H) \geq Fries(H)$. The following theorem implies that the equality holds.

Theorem 1.2 [15]**.** Let H be a hexagonal system with a perfect matching. Then $Af(H) = Fries(H)$.

In this paper we consider the anti-forcing spectra of cata-condensed hexagonal systems. In the next section, we introduce some graph-theoretic terms relevant to our subject and give some useful lemmas. In Section 3, we prove that the anti-forcing spectrum of any cata-condensed hexagonal system is continuous. It is quite different from the case for forcing spectrum. In fact, the forcing spectra of some cata-condensed hexagonal systems have gaps (see [15, 26]).

2 Preliminaries and lemmas

The *inner dual graph* H^* of a hexagonal system H is a graph whose vertices correspond to hexagons of H, and two such vertices are adjacent by an edge of H^* if and only if they correspond to two adjacent hexagons (i.e., these two hexagons have one common edge). Then H is *cata-condensed* if and only if H^* is a tree [3].

We can see that edges of a cata-condensed hexagonal system H can be classified into *boundary* edges (edges are on the boundary of H) and *shared* edges (edges are shared by two hexagons of H), and all vertices of H are on the boundary (i.e., H has no inner vertices). A subgraph G' of a graph G is *nice* if $G - V(G')$ (the graph obtained by deleting vertices of $V(G')$ and their incident edges from G) has a perfect matching. It is well known that every cata-condensed hexagonal system H has perfect matchings and every cycle in it is nice [6], so each hexagon of H can be M-alternating with respect to some perfect matching M of H.



Fig. 1. A cata-condensed hexagonal system with one branched hexagon and three kinks.



Fig. 2. The linear chain with five hexagons.

A hexagon s of a cata-condensed hexagonal system H has one, two, or three neighboring hexagons. s is called *terminal* if it has one neighboring hexagon, and *branched* if it has three neighboring hexagons. s has exactly two neighboring hexagons is a *kink* if s possesses two adjacent vertices of degree 2, is *linear* otherwise. An illustration is given in Fig. 1. A cata-condensed hexagonal system with no branched hexagons is called a *hexagonal chain*. A hexagonal chain with no kinks is called a *linear chain*, an example is shown in Fig. 2.

A linear chain B contained in a cata-condensed hexagonal system H is called *maximal* if B is not contained in other linear chains of H. For example, see Fig. 1, B_1 and B_2 are two maximal linear chains.

Let B be a maximal linear chain of a cata-condensed hexagonal system H. We draw a straight line l passing through the two centers of the two terminal hexagons of B. Let E be the set of those edges which intersecting l. By the Lemma 2.1 in [28], the following lemma is immediate.

Lemma 2.1. Let M be any perfect matching of H. Then $|M \cap E| = 1$.

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a compatible M-alternating set with respect to a perfect matching M of a planar bipartite graph G. Two cycles C_1 and C_2 of $\mathcal{A}$ are *crossing* if they share an edge e in M and the four edges adjacent to e alternate in C_1 and C_2 (i.e., C_1 enters into C_2 from one side and leaves from the other side via e). $\mathcal{A}$ *is non-crossing* if any two cycles in $\mathcal{A}$ are not crossing. Lei, Yeh and Zhang [15] proved that any compatible M-alternating set can be improved to be a non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with the same cardinality. Let H be a cata-condensed hexagonal system with a perfect matching M. For a cycle C of H, let $h(C)$ denote the number of hexagons in the interior of C. Then we can choose a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set $\mathcal{A}$ such that $|\mathcal{A}| = af(H, M)$ and $h(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{C \in \mathcal{A}} h(C)$ ($h(\mathcal{A})$ is called *h-index* of $\mathcal{A}$ [15]) is as small as possible. By using those notations, we give the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. $\mathcal{A}$ contains all M-alternating hexagons of H, and any two non-hexagon cycles of $\mathcal{A}$ have at most one common edge in M and are interior disjoint (i.e., have no common areas).

Proof. Let s be any M-alternating hexagon of H. Suppose $s \notin \mathcal{A}$. By the maximality of $|\mathcal{A}|$, $\mathcal{A} \cup \{s\}$ is not a compatible M-alternating set. So there is a cycle $C \in \mathcal{A}$ which is not compatible with s. Since any two M-alternating hexagons must be compatible, C is not a hexagon of H. s is in the interior of C since H is cata-condensed. We claim that $(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{s\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set. Otherwise there is a cycle $C' \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}$ such that C' and s are not compatible. Hence s is in the interior of C'. It implies that C and C' are either not compatible or crossing, a contradiction.

Therefore, $(\mathcal{A} \setminus \{C\}) \cup \{s\}$ is a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set with smaller h-index, a contradiction. Hence $s \in \mathcal{A}$.

Let C_1 and C_2 be two non-hexagon cycles in $\mathcal{A}$. First we prove that C_1 and C_2 are interior disjoint. If not, without loss of generality, we may suppose C_1 is contained in the interior of C_2 since C_1 and C_2 are not crossing. Then there is an M-alternating hexagon s in the interior of C_1 since C_1 is M-alternating [25, 29]. By the above discussion, we have that $s \in \mathcal{A}$ and s is compatible with both C_1 and C_2. Since H is cata-condensed, C_1 must pass through the vertices of s and the three edges of s in M, but not the other three edges of s. Hence C_1 must pass through the six edges going out of s. Similarly, C_2 must pass through the six edges going out of s. It implies that C_1 and C_2 are not compatible, a contradiction.

Next, we prove that C_1 and C_2 have at most one common edge in M. If C_1 and C_2 have at least two common edges in M, then there must generate inner vertices in H, a contradiction. □

Lemma 2.3. Let H be a cata-condensed hexagonal system with at least two hexagons. Then $af(H) < Fries(H)$.

Proof. By Theorem 1.2, $Af(H) = Fries(H)$. It is sufficient to prove that $af(H) < Af(H)$. Let s be a terminal hexagon of H. Then s has a neighboring hexagon s' since H has at least two hexagons. Let e be the sheared edge of s and s'. Since s' is nice, there is a perfect matching M of H such that s' is M-alternating and $e \in M$. Note that s is also M-alternating. So $F = M \triangle s$ is a perfect matching of H such that s is F-alternating. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a maximum non-crossing compatible F-alternating set with smallest h-index. By Lemma 2.2, we have that $s \in \mathcal{A}$. We can see that no cycle of $\mathcal{A}$ passing through the three edges of s' not in M. So $\mathcal{A} \cup \{s'\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set. By Theorem 1.1, we have that $af(H) \leq |\mathcal{A}| < |\mathcal{A} \cup \{s'\}| \leq af(H, M) \leq Af(H)$. □

3 Continuous anti-forcing spectra

Let a and b be two integer numbers, and $a \leq b$. In the following, we use $[a, b]$ to denote the integer interval from a to b.

Theorem 3.1. Let H be a cata-condensed hexagonal system. Then anti-forcing spectrum of H is continuous.

Proof. We proceed by induction on the number n of hexagons of H. If H is a single hexagon, then $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H) = \{1\}$. Suppose $n \geq 2$. Take a maximal linear chain B in H such that one end hexagon of B is a terminal hexagon of H. Let $h_0, h_1, \ldots, h_r$ $(r \geq 1)$ be hexagons of B in turn, and h_r be terminal (see Fig. 3).



Fig. 3. The illustration of the proof of Theorem 3.1.

If h_0 is also a terminal hexagon of H, then $H = B$ is a linear chain with $n > 1$ hexagons. We can check that $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H) = [1, 2]$.

If h_0 is not terminal, then h_0 is a kink or branched hexagon of H. Let B' be the linear chain obtained from B by removing hexagon h_0 and H' the cata-condensed hexagonal system obtained from H by removing the hexagons of B' (see Fig. 3). Then H' has less than n hexagons. By the induction hypothesis, the anti-forcing spectrum of H' is continuous. By Theorem 1.2, $Af(H') = Fries(H')$. Let $af(H') = a'$. Then $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H') = [a', Fries(H')]$.

Claim 1. $[a' + 1, Fries(H')] \subseteq \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

Since h_0 is not terminal, H' has at least two hexagons. By Lemma 2.3, $a' + 1 \leq Fries(H')$. For any $i \in [a' + 1, Fries(H')]$, we want to prove $i \in \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$. Since $i - 1 \in [a', Fries(H') - 1]$, by the induction hypothesis, there is a perfect matching M' of H' such that $af(H', M') = |\mathcal{A}'| = i - 1 \geq 1$, where $\mathcal{A}'$ is a maximum non-crossing compatible M'-alternating set of H' with smallest h-index. Note that $M = M' \cup \{f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_r, g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_r\}$ is a perfect matching of H and $d_i \notin M$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. By Lemma 2.1, either $e_4 \in M'$ or $e_1 \in M'$.

If $e_1 \in M'$, then h_1 is M-alternating. By Lemma 2.2, $h_1 \in \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a maximum non-crossing compatible M-alternating set of H with smallest h-index. We can see that $\mathcal{A} \backslash \{h_1\}$ is a compatible M'-alternating set of H', and $|\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{A} \backslash \{h_1\}| + 1 \leq |\mathcal{A}'| + 1 = i$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{A}' \cup \{h_1\}$ is a compatible M-alternating set of H, so $i = |\mathcal{A}'| + 1 = |\mathcal{A}' \cup \{h_1\}| \leq |\mathcal{A}|$, i.e., $|\mathcal{A}| = i$. By Theorem 1.1, $af(H, M) = i \in \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

From now on, we suppose $e_4 \in M'$. Then $\{e_2, e_6\} \subseteq M'$. So h_0 is M'-alternating and M-alternating. By Lemma 2.2, $h_0 \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $h_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. See Fig. 3, $H - e_2 - e_4 - e_6$ consists of three disjoint sub-catacondensed hexagonal systems: H_1, H_2 and B' (the former two may be single edges). Note that there is a possible non-hexagon cycle Q in $\mathcal{A}$ which containing h_0.

If such Q exists, then Q must pass through g_1 and f_1 since Q and h_0 are compatible.

So $\mathcal{A}\setminus\{Q\}$ is a compatible M'-alternating set of H', we have $|\mathcal{A}\setminus\{Q\}|\leq|\mathcal{A}'|=i-1$. If $|\mathcal{A}'|=|\mathcal{A}\setminus\{Q\}|$, then $af(H,M)=|\mathcal{A}|=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$. If $|\mathcal{A}'|>|\mathcal{A}\setminus\{Q\}|$, then $|\mathcal{A}'|\geq|\mathcal{A}|$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{A}'$ is also a compatible M-alternating set, so $|\mathcal{A}'|\leq|\mathcal{A}|$. We have $|\mathcal{A}|=|\mathcal{A}'|=i-1$. Note that Q does not pass through e_3 and e_5. Let $M_j=M\triangle h_0\triangle h_1\triangle\ldots\triangle h_j$ $(j=0,1,\ldots,r)$, $Q_1=(E(Q)\cap E(H_1))\cup\{e_5\}$ and $Q_2=(E(Q)\cap E(H_2))\cup\{e_3\}$. Then Q_1 and Q_2 both are M_0-alternating cycles. We can see that $(\mathcal{A}\setminus\{Q\})\cup\{Q_1,Q_2,h_1\}$ is a compatible M_0-alternating set with cardinality $i+1$, so $c'(M_0)\geq i+1$. On the other hand, $c'(M_0)$ is at most $|\mathcal{A}|+2=i+1$. So $c'(M_0)=i+1$. Note that h_r is the unique M_r-alternating hexagon contained in B, by Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have $af(H,M_r)=c'(M_r)=c'(M_0)-1=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

If such cycle Q does not exist, then there is no cycle in $\mathcal{A}$ which passing through the edges going out of h_0 since $h_0\in\mathcal{A}$. So $\mathcal{A}$ is also a maximum compatible M'-alternating set on H', and $|\mathcal{A}|=|\mathcal{A}'|=i-1$. Note that any cycle of $\mathcal{A}\setminus\{h_0\}$ is completely contained in H_1 or H_2. Let i_1 (resp. i_2) be the number of cycles of $\mathcal{A}$ which are completely contained in H_1 (resp. H_2). Then $|\mathcal{A}|=i_1+i_2+1=i-1$. Since M and M_0 only differ on h_0 and $e_5\in M_0$ (resp. $e_3\in M_0$), the size of maximum compatible M_0-alternating set on H_1 (resp. H_2) is i_1 or i_1+1 (resp. i_2 or i_2+1). Let $\mathcal{A}_0$ be a maximum compatible non-crossing M_0-alternating set of H with minimal h-index. Note that h_0 and h_1 both are M_0-alternating. By Lemma 2.2, $h_0\in\mathcal{A}_0$ and $h_1\in\mathcal{A}_0$. It implies that cycles in $\mathcal{A}_0\setminus\{h_0,h_1\}$ are completely contained in H_1 or H_2. Hence $i=i_1+i_2+2\leq|\mathcal{A}_0|\leq i_1+i_2+4=i+2$. If $|\mathcal{A}_0|=i$, then $af(H,M_0)=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$. If $|\mathcal{A}_0|=i+1$, then $(\mathcal{A}_0\setminus\{h_0,h_1\})\cup\{h_r\}$ is a maximum compatible M_r-alternating set with size i since M_0 and M_r only differ on B'. So $af(H,M_r)=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

If $|\mathcal{A}_0|=i+2$, then H_1 (resp. H_2) contains exactly i_1+1 (resp. i_2+1) cycles of $\mathcal{A}_0$. Let M_0' (resp. M_0'') be the restriction of M_0 to H_1 (resp. H_2). Then $af(H_1,M_0')=i_1+1$ (resp. $af(H_2,M_0'')=i_2+1$). Hence $af(H_1)\leq i_1+1$ (resp. $af(H_2)\leq i_2+1$). If $af(H_1)<i_1+1$ (resp. $af(H_2)<i_2+1$), then $i_1\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H_1)$ (resp. $i_2\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H_2)$) by the induction hypothesis. So there is a perfect matching F_1 (resp. F_2) of H_1 (resp. H_2) such that $c'(F_1)=i_1$ (resp. $c'(F_2)=i_2$). We can see that $M_1^*=F_1\cup(M_r\cap(E(H_2)\cup E(B')))$ (resp. $M_2^*=F_2\cup(M_r\cap(E(H_1)\cup E(B'))))$ is a perfect matching of H such that $af(H,M_1^*)=c'(M_1^*)=i_1+i_2+1+1=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$ (resp. $af(H,M_2^*)=c'(M_2^*)=i_2+i_1+1+1=i\in\text{Spec}_{af}(H)$).

Now suppose $af(H_1)=i_1+1$ and $af(H_2)=i_2+1$, F' is a perfect matching of H' with $af(H',F')=a'$. Note that $F=F'\cup\{f_1,f_2,\ldots,f_r,g_1,g_2,\ldots,g_r\}$ is a perfect matching of H. By Lemma 2.2, either $e_1\in F'$ or $e_4\in F'$. We assert that $e_4\in F'$. Otherwise $e_1\in F'$, then the restrictions F_1' and F_2' of F' to H_1 and H_2 are perfect matchings of H_1 and H_2 respectively. So $a'\geq c'(F_1')+c'(F_2')\geq af(H_1)+af(H_2)=i_1+1+i_2+1=i\in[a'+1,Fries(H')]$, a contradiction. Since $e_4\in F'$,

$\{e_2, e_6\} \subseteq F'$. So h_0 is F'-alternating, and $F'\triangle h_0$ is a perfect matching of H'. Since the restrictions of $F'\triangle h_0$ to H_1 and H_2 are perfect matchings of H_1 and H_2 respectively, $c'(F'\triangle h_0) \geq af(H_1) + af(H_2) + 1 = i + 1 \geq a' + 2$. On the other hand, by Lemma 2.2, we have that $c'(F'\triangle h_0) \leq a' + 2$. So $c'(F'\triangle h_0) = a' + 2$ and $a' + 1 = i$. Let $\mathcal{A}^*$ be a maximum non-crossing compatible $F'\triangle h_0$-alternating set of H' with minimal h-index. Then $|\mathcal{A}^*| = c'(F'\triangle h_0) = a' + 2$. Note that $c'(F') = a'$, but $c'(F'\triangle h_0) = a' + 2$, it implies that there must be an $F'\triangle h_0$-alternating cycle C_1 (resp. C_2) of $\mathcal{A}^*$ passing through e_5 (resp. e_3) and contained in H_1 (resp. H_2). We can see that $D = (C_1 - e_5) \cup (C_2 - e_3) \cup \{e_2, e_4, e_6, g_1, f_1, g_1', f_1', d_1\}$ is an F-alternating cycle containing h_0, and D is compatible with each cycle of $\mathcal{A}^* \setminus \{C_1, C_2\}$. So $\{D\} \cup (\mathcal{A}^* \setminus \{C_1, C_2\})$ is a compatible F-alternating set with size i. By theorem 1.1, $af(H, F) \geq i$. On the other hand, by Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 2.2, we have $i = a' + 1 = c'(F') + 1 \geq c'(F) = af(H, F)$. Therefore, $af(H, F) = i \in \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

By the arbitrariness of i, we proved that $[a' + 1, Fries(H')] \subseteq \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

Claim 2. $a' \leq af(H)$.

Let $af(H) = a$, M be a perfect matching of H with $af(H, M) = a$. By Lemma 2.1, just one edge of $\{e_4, e_1, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_r\}$ belongs to M. If $e_4 \in M$ or $e_1 \in M$, then the restriction M' of M to H' is a perfect matching of H'. So $a' \leq c'(M') \leq c'(M) = a$. If $d_i \in M$ $(1 \leq i \leq r)$, then h_i is M-alternating. Let $M_i = M\triangle h_i\triangle h_{i-1}\triangle \cdots \triangle\ h_1$. Then M_i is a perfect matching of H and $e_1 \in M_i$. Note that M and M_i only differ on B'. By Lemma 2.2, $c'(M_i) \leq c'(M) + 1 = a + 1$. Since $e_1 \in M_i$, the restriction M_i' of M_i to H' is a perfect matching of H'. So $a' \leq c'(M_i')$. Let $\mathcal{A}_i'$ be a maximum non-crossing compatible M_i'-alternating set with minimal h-indices in H'. Then $\mathcal{A}_i' \cup \{h_1\}$ is a compatible M_i-alternating set of H since h_1 is M_i-alternating. Hence $|\mathcal{A}_i' \cup \{h_1\}| \leq c'(M_i)$. Further, $a' + 1 \leq c'(M_i') + 1 = |\mathcal{A}_i'| + 1 \leq c'(M_i) \leq a + 1$, i.e., $a' \leq a$.

Claim 3. $Fries(H) \leq Fries(H') + 2$.

Let M be a perfect matching of H and $h'(M)$ denote the the number of M-alternating hexagons of H. Suppose $h'(M) = Fries(H)$. By Lemma 2.1, only one of $\{e_4, e_1, d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_r\}$ belongs to M. If $e_1 \in M$ or $e_4 \in M$, then the restriction M' of M to H' is a perfect matching of H'. Note that B' contains at most one M-alternating hexagon. So $h'(M) \leq h'(M') + 1 \leq Fries(H') + 1$. If $d_i \in M$ $(1 \leq i \leq r)$, then h_i is M-alternating. Let $M_i = M\triangle h_i\triangle h_{i-1}\triangle \cdots \triangle\ h_1$. Then M_i is a perfect matching of H such that the restriction M_i' of M_i to H' is a perfect matching of H'. Since h_1 is the unique M_i-alternating hexagon contained in B', $h'(M_i) = h'(M_i') + 1$. Note that $h'(M_i) = h'(M)$ or $h'(M_i) = h'(M) - 1$ since B is a linear chain. If $h'(M_i) = h'(M)$, then $h'(M) = h'(M_i') + 1 \leq Fries(H') + 1$. If $h'(M_i) = h'(M) - 1$, then $h'(M) = h'(M_i') + 2 \leq Fries(H') + 2$.

Claim 4. If $Fries(H) = Fries(H') + 2$, then $Fries(H') + 1 \in \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

The proof of Claim 3 implies that if $Fries(H) = Fries(H') + 2$, then there is a perfect matching M of H with $h'(M) = Fries(H)$ such that just two adjacent M-alternating hexagons h_i and h_{i+1} $(1 \leq i < r)$ contained in B'. Let $M^* = M \triangle h_{i+1} \triangle h_{i+2} \triangle \cdots \triangle h_r$. Then M^* is a perfect matching of H and h_r is the unique M^*-alternating hexagon contained in B'. By Lemma 2.2, $c'(M^*) = h'(M) - 1 = Fries(H') + 1$. By Theorem 1.1, $af(H, M^*) = Fries(H') + 1 \in \mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H)$.

We can see that Claims 1, 2, 3 and 4 imply that there is no gap in the anti-forcing spectrum of H. □

According to Theorems 1.2 and 3.1, the following corollary is immediate.

Corollary 3.2. Let H be a cata-condensed hexagonal system. Then $\mathrm{Spec}_{af}(H) = [af(H), Fries(H)]$.

References

[1] P. Adams, M. Mahdian and E. S. Mahmoodian, On the forced matching numbers of bipartite graphs, *Discrete Math.* **281** (2004) 1–12.

[2] P. Afshani, H. Hatami and E.S. Mahmoodian, On the spectrum of the forced matching number of graphs, *Australas. J. Combin.* **30** (2004) 147–160.

[3] A. T. Balaban and F. Harary, Chemical graphs–V: Enumeration and proposed nomenclature of benzenoid cata-condensed polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, *Tetrahedron* **24** (1968) 2505–2516.

[4] Z. Che and Z. Chen, Forcing on perfect matchings-A survey, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **66** (2011) 93–136.

[5] E. Clar, *The Aromatic Sextex*, J. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1972.

[6] S. J. Cyvin and I. Gutman, *Kekulé Structures in Benzenoid Hydrocarbons*, Lecture Notes in Chemistry, Vol **46**, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1988.

[7] H. Deng, The anti-forcing number of hexagonal chains, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **58** (2007) 675–682.

[8] H. Deng, The anti-forcing number of double hexagonal chains, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **60** (2008) 183–192.

[9] K. Fries, Uber byclische verbindungen und ihren vergleich mit dem naphtalin, *Ann. Chem.* **454** (1927) 121–324.

[10] F. Harary, D. Klein and T. Živković, Graphical properties of polyhexes: perfect matching vector and forcing, *J. Math. Chem.* **6** (1991) 295–306.

[11] X. Jiang, *Study on forcing matching number and spectrum of some classes of graphs*, Ph.D. Thesis, Lanzhou University, 2011 (in chinese).

[12] X. Jiang and H. Zhang, On forcing matching number of boron-nitrogen fullerene graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **159** (2011) 1581–1593.

[13] D. Klein and M. Randić, Innate degree of freedom of a graph, *J. Comput. Chem.* **8** (1987) 516–521.

[14] F. Lam and L. Pachter, Forcing number for stop signs, *Theor. Comput. Sci.* **303** (2003) 409–416.

[15] H. Lei, Y. Yeh and H. Zhang, Anti-forcing numbers of perfect matchings of graphs, (2014), http://arxiv.org/pdf/1406.3796v1.pdf.

[16] L. Pachter and P. Kim, Forcing matchings on square grids, *Discrete Math.* **190** (1998) 287–294.

[17] M. Randić and D. Vukičević, Kekulé structures of fullerene C_{70}, *Croat. Chem. Acta* **79** (2006) 471–481.

[18] M.E. Riddle, The minimum forcing number for the torus and hypercube, *Discrete Math.* **245** (2002) 283–292.

[19] D. Vukičević, I. Gutman and M. Randić, On instability of fullerene C_{72}, *Croat. Chem. Acta* **79** (2006) 429–436.

[20] D. Vukičević and M. Randić, On Kekuklé structures of buckminsterfullerene, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **401** (2005) 446–450.

[21] D. Vukičević and N. Trinajstié, On the anti-forcing number of benzenoids, *J. Math. Chem.* **42** (2007) 575–583.

[22] D. Vukičević and N. Trinajstié, On the anti-Kekulé number and anti-forcing number of cata-condensed benzenoids, *J. Math. Chem.* **43** (2008) 719–726.

[23] H. Wang, D. Ye and H. Zhang, The forcing number of toroidal polyhexes, *J. Math. Chem.* **43** (2008) 457–475.

[24] L. Xu, H. Bian and F. Zhang, Maximum forcing number of hexagonal systems, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **70** (2013) 493–500.

[25] F. Zhang, X. Guo and R. Chen, *Z*-transformation graphs of perfect matchings of hexagonal systems, *Discrete Math.* **72** (1988) 405–415.

[26] H. Zhang and K. Deng, Forcing spectrum of a hexagonal system with a forcing edge, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **73** (2015), in press.

[27] H. Zhang, D. Ye and W.C. Shiu, Forcing matching numbers of fullerene graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **158** (2010) 573–582.

[28] H. Zhang, H. Yao and D. Yang, A min-max result on outerplane bipartite graphs, *Appl. Math. Lett.* **20** (2007) 199–205.

[29] H. Zhang and F. Zhang, Plane elementary bipartite graphs, *Discrete Appl. Math.* **105** (2000) 291–311.

[30] Q. Zhang, H. Bian and E. Vumar, On the anti-kekulé and anti-forcing number of cata-condensed phenylenes, *MATCH Commun. Math. Comput. Chem.* **65** (2011) 799–806.